

Fractional generalization of the Ginzburg-Landau equation: An unconventional approach to critical phenomena in complex media

A. V. Milovanov *

*Space Research Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences,
84/32 Profsoyuznaya street, 117997 Moscow, Russia*

J. Juul Rasmussen

*Department of Optics and Plasma Research, Risø National Laboratory,
OPL-128, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark*

Abstract

Equations built on fractional derivatives prove to be a powerful tool in the description of complex systems when the effects of singularity, fractal supports, and long-range dependence play a role. In this paper, we advocate an application of the fractional derivative formalism to a fairly general class of critical phenomena when the organization of the system near the phase transition point is influenced by a competing nonlocal ordering. Fractional modifications of the free energy functional at criticality and of the widely known Ginzburg-Landau equation central to the classical Landau theory of second-type phase transitions are discussed in some detail. An implication of the fractional Ginzburg-Landau equation is a renormalization of the transition temperature owing to the nonlocality present.

Key words: fractional kinetics, phase transition, long-range dependence

PACS: 74.20.De, 64.60.Ak, 05.70.Fh, 64.60.-i, 63.22.+m

The formulation of fractional kinetics [1] has led to a considerable progress in our vision of complex systems at the microscopic level. The use of fractional derivative operators – unconventional analytical tools extending the familiar high-school calculus to a broader class of mathematical objects – has been recognized in the modern physics [2] owing to its elegance and the proximity

* Corresponding author.

Email address: amilovan@mx.iki.rssi.ru (A. V. Milovanov).

to the standard, well established algorithms. The fractional kinetic equations dealing with generalized derivatives in space and time incorporate in a natural, unified way the key features of non-Gaussianity and long-range dependence that often break down the restrictive assumptions of locality and lack of correlations underlying the conventional statistical mechanical paradigm. From a probabilistic standpoint, fractional kinetics extends Gaussian stochastic processes (i.e., Brownian random walks) by taking into account long-range correlated events in the tail of the probability density function. Such events dominate, for instance, Lévy-type processes [3] and fractal time random walks (FTRW's) [4], the simplest model realizations accounting for anomalous transport phenomena in turbulent media [5]. Manifestations of fractional kinetics have been found in, e.g., point vortex flows [6], low confinement mode plasmas [7], non-Gaussianity of fluctuations measured in the edge and scrape-off layer region of fusion devices [8], etc. A comprehension of the essential role played by FTRW and Lévy statistics in the microscopic description of turbulence and chaos stipulated fractional generalizations of the diffusion and Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equations, discussed in a series of publications [9,10,11,12,13]. Beside the theory of turbulent diffusion, applications of fractional kinetics concern the fractional Kramers problem [14], relaxation in polymer systems and rebinding phenomena in proteins [15], scale-invariance and universality near a phase transition point [16], cosmic rays acceleration [17], the dynamics of fracton excitations [18], including modulational instability [19] and self-focusing of waves on fractals [20], and many other realizations [2]. The current state of the art is summarized in review articles [19,21,22].

In this Letter, we advocate an application of the fractional derivative formalism to the thermodynamics of second-type phase transitions in the presence of a coexisting nonlocal ordering which may influence the properties of the basic “symmetric” phase below the transition point. As an example, we mention highly correlated electron liquid states, such as electron liquids with fractionally charged excitations [23], as well as high-temperature superconducting fluid phases in copper-oxide compounds and their derivatives [24] where the nonlocal ordering can be associated with the so-called “stripy” order [25]. A growing evidence of stripes and of their role in the superconducting transition at high temperatures is a hot topic in condensed matter research [26].

In what follows, we imply a phase diagram which accommodates two thermodynamically distinct phases, the “symmetric” (superconducting) phase below the transition temperature T_c , and “asymmetric” (normal) phase above the T_c . As usual, the deviation between the symmetric and normal phases for $T \rightarrow T_c$ is characterized by the order parameter, $\psi = \psi(x)$, which is assumed to be an analytical function of a 1-dimensional coordinate variable, x .

Our study has two interconnected goals. First, we suggest that an interaction between the ψ order and a coexisting nonlocal ordering can be characterized

by a fractional generalization of the free energy expansion near the transition point. Second, we demonstrate that the order parameter ψ obeys an integro-differential equation which can be fairly considered as a fractional extension of the widely known Ginzburg-Landau equation, central to the classical Landau theory of second-type phase transitions. This unconventional, fractional equation incorporates in an analytically appealing way the effect of long-range dependence posed by the underlying nonlocal ordering.

We start up with the conventional free energy expansion (Refs. [27] and [28])

$$F = F_n + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx \left[\frac{\hbar^2}{4m} |\nabla_x \psi|^2 + a|\psi|^2 + \frac{b}{2} |\psi|^4 \right] \quad (1)$$

in vicinity of the critical point $T \rightarrow T_c$. The term marked by F_n denotes the contribution from the normal phase. Equation (1) concerns with the real-space derivative $\nabla_x \psi$ along the coordinate x . For the sake of simplicity, we shall also use the notation ψ'_x for $\nabla_x \psi$. The coefficient $a = \alpha(T - T_c)$ in Eq. (1) is proportional to the deviation between T and T_c . Note that $a = \alpha(T - T_c)$ changes sign at criticality: This behavior does not depend on the nature of the symmetric and normal phases and mirrors the generic features of topology of the phase diagram. The system-specific information is contained in the parameters α and b . The value of $\alpha > 0$ in accordance with the fact that the symmetric phase occurs below T_c . The coefficient $b > 0$ depends solely on the mass density of the material (but not on the thermodynamic temperature T). The bulk distribution of the order parameter extremizes the free energy functional in Eq. (1), leading to the classical Ginzburg-Landau equation [28]

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{4m} \nabla_x^2 \psi + a\psi + b|\psi|^2 \psi = 0. \quad (2)$$

The key issue about Eq. (2) is the infinitesimal – local – character of the $\psi(x)$ variation, manifest in the assumption that only a differential contribution $\propto |\nabla_x \psi|^2$ in the free energy density comes into play for $T \rightarrow T_c$. Statistically, this means that the blobs of the symmetric phase appear *at random* throughout the material as the temperature T approaches the critical range. The property of randomness is explicit from the convolution of $\nabla_x \psi$ with a Gaussian $G_\lambda(x) = \exp[-x^2/\lambda]/\sqrt{\pi\lambda}$, where λ is the correlation (coarse-graining) length, physically corresponding to the typical size of the blobs:

$$\nabla_x \psi * G_\lambda(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dy \psi'_y G_\lambda(x - y). \quad (3)$$

At length scales x large compared to λ , the Gaussian $G_\lambda(x)$ in Eq. (3) can be

fairly approximated by the Dirac delta function $\delta(x)$, yielding $\nabla_x \psi * G_\lambda(x) \rightarrow \nabla_x \psi * \delta(x)$. The convolution $\nabla_x \psi * \delta(x)$ is then exactly the local derivative $\nabla_x \psi \equiv \psi'_x$.

We now turn to the order parameter $\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{S}(x)$ for the coexisting nonlocal symmetry. The interaction between ψ and $\mathfrak{S}$ orders may be envisaged as a *nonrandom* appearance of the “superconducting” blobs for $T \rightarrow T_c$ over a broad range of scales $x \gg \lambda$. In this connection, the parameter $\mathfrak{S}(x)$ acquires the role of the Gaussian $G_\lambda(x) \rightarrow \delta(x)$ in Eq. (3). Replacing $\delta(x)$ by $\mathfrak{S}(x)$, one encounters the convolution $\nabla_x \psi * \mathfrak{S}(x)$, which substitutes the local derivative $\nabla_x \psi * \delta(x)$ in the free energy expansion (1). We may now *postulate* the free energy expansion for a long-range correlated thermodynamical system at criticality in the generalized form

$$F = F_n + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx \left[A_{\mathfrak{S}} |\nabla_x \psi * \mathfrak{S}|^2 + a_{\mathfrak{S}} |\psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2} b_{\mathfrak{S}} |\psi|^4 \right] \quad (4)$$

where $\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{S}(x)$ quantifies the underlying nonlocal symmetry. The coefficients $A_{\mathfrak{S}}$, $a_{\mathfrak{S}}$, and $b_{\mathfrak{S}}$ introduced in Eq. (4) replace $\hbar^2/4m$, a , and b , respectively, in the conventional free energy expansion in Eq. (1).

Our further interest is on the specific type of nonlocality consistent with a self-similar – fractal – organization. The focus on fractals [29] is motivated by a general tendency of complex systems to reveal, at or near a critical point, scale-invariant dynamical properties [16]. The phenomenon is often associated with the issue of *self-organized criticality* [30]. Self-organized critical behavior, due to multiscale Josephson coupling of the superconducting domains, was advocated for granular and polycrystalline superconductors in Ref. [31]. In the framework of our study, we assume the nonlocal symmetry has fractal support considered as a Cantor set [29] on the 1-dimensional Euclidean axis x . The fractal geometry of the support appears in the power-law behavior of the order parameter $\mathfrak{S}$: This behavior, in turn, may be identified with the scaling of the two-point correlation function for the fractal distribution [29]:

$$\mathfrak{S}(x - y) = \mathfrak{S}_0 |x - y|^{-\mu} \quad (5)$$

where $\mathfrak{S}_0$ is a normalization constant. The power exponent μ in Eq. (5) can further be expressed in terms of the Hausdorff fractal dimension d_f of the Cantor set:

$$\mu = 1 - d_f. \quad (6)$$

By its definition [29], the Hausdorff dimension of a Cantor set ranges from 0 to 1. In the latter case, the set occupies the entire Euclidean axis x . Accordingly,

the power exponent μ varies from a maximal value equal 1 to a minimal value equal 0. In view of Eq. (5), the convolution $\nabla_x \psi * \mathfrak{S}(x)$ becomes

$$\nabla_x \psi * \mathfrak{S}(x) = \mathfrak{S}_0 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dy \psi'_y |x - y|^{-\mu}. \quad (7)$$

The integration in Eq. (7) can be expressed in a suitable compact form by using the notion of a *fractional derivative* [32]. In fact, integrating by parts in Eq. (7), one gets

$$\nabla_x \psi * \mathfrak{S}(x) = \mathfrak{S}_0 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dy \psi(y) \nabla_{-y} |x - y|^{-\mu}. \quad (8)$$

The operation ∇_{-y} applied to $|x - y|$ is equivalent with the derivative ∇_x over the parameter x : This derivative can then be taken out of the integral sign, yielding

$$\nabla_x \psi * \mathfrak{S}(x) = \mathfrak{S}_0 \nabla_x \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dy \psi(y) |x - y|^{-\mu}. \quad (9)$$

Splitting the integration from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$ into two integrals, from $-\infty$ to x and from x to $+\infty$, and taking into account the reflection symmetry $\psi(-y) = \psi(y)$ for the ψ order, from Eq. (9) one obtains

$$\nabla_x \psi * \mathfrak{S}(x) = 2\mathfrak{S}_0 \nabla_x \int_{-\infty}^x dy \psi(y) (x - y)^{-\mu}. \quad (10)$$

Setting the normalization $2\mathfrak{S}_0 = 1/\Gamma(1 - \mu)$ in Eq. (5), we find $\nabla_x \psi * \mathfrak{S}(x) \equiv \nabla_x^\mu \psi$, where

$$\nabla_x^\mu \psi \equiv \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 - \mu)} \nabla_x \int_{-\infty}^x dy \psi(y) (x - y)^{-\mu} \quad (11)$$

is exactly the Riesz definition [32] of the fractional derivative of order $0 < \mu \leq 1$, and Γ denotes the Euler gamma function. Note that ∇_x^μ is *integro-differential* operator for all $0 < \mu < 1$. In the “integer” limit of $\mu \rightarrow 1$, the operation in Eq. (11) is equivalent with the conventional first-order derivative ∇_x : The proof rests on the Abel identities discussed in Ref. [33]. In terms of

fractional derivatives, the free energy expansion in Eq. (4) reads

$$F = F_n + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx \left[A_\mu |\nabla_x^\mu \psi|^2 + a_\mu |\psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2} b_\mu |\psi|^4 \right]. \quad (12)$$

Here we changed the subscript $\mathfrak{S}$ to μ everywhere in $A_\mathfrak{S}$, $a_\mathfrak{S}$, and $b_\mathfrak{S}$. Expression (12) leads to the issue of a *fractional Ginzburg-Landau equation*, as we now proceed to show. In fact, varying the integral in Eq. (12) over the complex conjugate ψ^* and considering ψ and ψ^* as independent order parameters, we have

$$\delta F = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx \left[A_\mu \nabla_x^\mu \psi \nabla_x^\mu \delta \psi^* + a_\mu \psi \delta \psi^* + b_\mu |\psi|^2 \psi \delta \psi^* \right]. \quad (13)$$

Making use of the integration-by-part formula [32]

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dy \varphi_1(y) \nabla_y^\mu \varphi_2(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dy \varphi_2(y) \nabla_{-y}^\mu \varphi_1(y) \quad (14)$$

from Eq. (13) one arrives at

$$\delta F = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx \left[A_\mu \nabla_{-x}^\mu \nabla_x^\mu \psi + a_\mu \psi + b_\mu |\psi|^2 \psi \right] \delta \psi^* \quad (15)$$

yielding, in view of the extremum $\delta F = 0$,

$$A_\mu \nabla_{-x}^\mu \nabla_x^\mu \psi + a_\mu \psi + b_\mu |\psi|^2 \psi = 0. \quad (16)$$

Varying the integral in Eq. (12) over ψ leads to the conjugate equation

$$A_\mu \nabla_{-x}^\mu \nabla_x^\mu \psi^* + a_\mu \psi^* + b_\mu |\psi|^2 \psi^* = 0 \quad (17)$$

which is physically identical to Eq. (16). Equation (16) can be considered as a fractional generalization of the Ginzburg-Landau Eq. (2). The fractional Ginzburg-Landau Eq. (16) determines the bulk distribution of the order parameter ψ in the presence of a coexisting nonlocal symmetry, whose support is a Cantor set of the Hausdorff dimension $d_f = 1 - \mu$. The coefficient A_μ consistent with the fractional diffeo-integration in Eqs. (12) and (16) could be defined by

$$A_\mu = \lambda^{2\mu-2} \frac{\hbar^2}{4m} \quad (18)$$

where λ is the microscopic correlation length. In the conventional case of $\mu \rightarrow 1$, the value of A_μ reduces to $\hbar^2/4m$.

Let us now discuss a likely form for the coefficient a_μ in Eq. (16). Without loss of generality, we may admit that a_μ is a linear function on thermodynamic temperature T . (We assume that all explicit nonlinearities have already been allocated to a single term traced by b_μ .) Let a_μ cross zero at some $T = T_\mu$, i.e.,

$$a_\mu = \alpha(T - T_\mu). \quad (19)$$

Equation (19) is a simplest extension of the conventional formula $a = \alpha(T - T_c)$ central to the classical Landau theory (Refs. [27] and [28]). An important issue about Eq. (19) is that the cross-over temperature T_μ where a_μ changes sign may not coincide with the transition temperature T_c when the effects of nonlocality play a role (i.e., when the index μ is smaller than 1). From the standpoint of a formal derivation, the value of T_c enabling the occurrence of a nontrivial ψ order in the presence of the competing nonlocal symmetry decouples from T_μ owing to the fractional nature of the Riesz operators ∇_{-x}^μ and ∇_x^μ which integrate the response from the heavy-tailed correlation function $\Im(x - y)$ in Eqs. (11) and (16) and thereby contribute (along with the parameter a_μ) into an amplitude in front of ψ . (This amplitude then balances the nonlinear term $b_\mu|\psi|^2$ below the transition point.) Physically, the deviation between T_c and T_μ has the sense of a characteristic energy of correlations contained in the fractional Laplacian, $A_\mu \nabla_{-x}^\mu \nabla_x^\mu$. By order of magnitude,

$$T_c - T_\mu \sim A_\mu / \alpha \lambda^{2\mu} \Gamma^2(1 - \mu) \quad (20)$$

where Γ is the Euler gamma function. As μ tends to 1, the deviation in Eq. (20) vanishes: $\Gamma(1 - \mu) \rightarrow \infty$ leading to $T_\mu \rightarrow T_c$. The conventional expression $a = \alpha(T - T_c)$ is then recovered from Eq. (19). In this limit, the nonlocal symmetry confines on a set whose Hausdorff measure is zero, i.e., $d_f \rightarrow 0$ for $\mu \rightarrow 1$. This behavior reproduces the assumptions of the classical theory [28].

In the opposite limit of $\mu \rightarrow 0$, the fractal support underlying the nonlocal symmetry extends to the whole of the 1-dimensional coordinate space whose Hausdorff measure is now maximized to be $d_f \rightarrow 1$. This almost regular distribution bears features enabling to associate it with a “stripe” [25], a long-range ordering that seems to mediate superconductivity in complex materials such as copper-oxide compounds and their derivatives [26].

As $\mu \rightarrow 0$, the gamma function in Eq. (20) drops to a minimal value equal 1, enabling a considerable deviation between T_c and T_μ . It can be conjectured that, in general, this deviation accounts for the “anomalous” transition

temperatures observed in high-temperature superconductors. A self-consistent estimate of the parameter T_c may then be obtained from Eq. (20). A key step is the expression (Refs. [28] and [34])

$$\alpha \sim \Upsilon \times (T_c/\varepsilon_F) \quad (21)$$

which relates the quantity α to the system-specific characteristics such as electron energy at the Fermi edge, ε_F (typically, of the order of few eV). The coefficient Υ in Eq. (21) depends on the nature of the microscopic pairing mechanism (e.g., phonon, fracton, or exciton) (see Refs. [18] and [35]). In the case of phonons – acoustic or (quasi)acoustic modes serving as an interface for the conventional Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer (BCS) picture of superconductivity in regular crystals [36] – the value of $\Upsilon \sim 7$ (Refs. [28] and [34]), but it can be much smaller (of the order of 1 or even less) in the Little’s exciton scenario, in which phonons are replaced by other electrons [37]. Combining Eqs. (20) and (21), we find, in the extreme of $\mu \rightarrow 0$,

$$T_c \sim \frac{\hbar}{2\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_F}{m\Upsilon}} \quad (22)$$

provided that $T_c \gg T_\mu$. Assuming, further, the correlation length λ is of nanoscales – the range typically found for the high-temperature superconductors [38] – from Eq. (22) one concludes a characteristic transition temperature $T_c \sim 100$ K where the estimate $\Upsilon \sim 7$ has been used. Non-BCS pairing processes corresponding to smaller values of Υ would imply a considerably higher critical temperature T_c , up to room-temperature values. A feasible role of such processes in two-dimensional electron systems with multi-scale long-range correlations is addressed in Refs. [35] and [39]. A fractional kinetics constituent in the occurrence of the ensuing superconducting fluid state will be the subject of a forthcoming publication. We believe this constituent is crucial for the unconventional superconductivity in materials with complex microscopic organization.

A. V. M. is grateful to G. M. Zaslavsky for illuminating discussions on different aspects of fractional kinetics. This study was sponsored by the Science Support Foundation, INTAS Grant 03-51-3738, RFBR project 03-02-16967, and “Scientific School” Grant 1739.2003.2.

References

- [1] M. F. Shlesinger, G. M. Zaslavsky, and J. Klafter, *Nature (London)* **363**, 31 (1993).

- [2] R. Hilfer, *Applications of Fractional Calculus in Physics* (World Scientific, River Edge, N. J., 2000).
- [3] E. W. Montroll and M. F. Shlesinger, in *Studies in Statistical Mechanics*, edited by J. Lebowitz and E. W. Montroll (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984), Vol. 11, p. 1.
- [4] B. D. Hughes, E. W. Montroll, and M. F. Shlesinger, *J. Stat. Phys.* **28**, 111 (1982).
- [5] J. Klafter, M. F. Shlesinger, and G. Zumofen, *Phys. Today* **49**, 33 (1996).
- [6] X. Leoncini, L. Kuznetsov, and G. M. Zaslavsky, *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **19**, 259 (2004).
- [7] B. A. Carreras, *IEEE Transactions of Plasma Science* **25**, 1281 (1997); G. Zimbardo, *Commun. in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation* **8**, 443 (2003).
- [8] G. M. Zaslavsky, M. Edelman, H. Weitzner, B. Carreras, G. McKee, *et al.*, *Phys. Plasmas* **7**, 3691 (2000); B. A. Carreras, V. E. Lynch, and B. LaBombard, *Phys. Plasmas* **8**, 3702 (2001).
- [9] M. Giona and H. E. Roman, *J. Phys. A* **185**, 87 (1992).
- [10] G. M. Zaslavsky, *Chaos* **4**, 25 (1994); *Physica D* **76**, 110 (1994).
- [11] A. Saichev and G. M. Zaslavsky, *Chaos* **7**, 753 (1997).
- [12] H. Weitzner and G. M. Zaslavsky, *Chaos* **11**, 384 (2001).
- [13] A. V. Milovanov, *Phys. Rev. E* **63**, 047301 (2001).
- [14] I. M. Sokolov, J. Klafter, and A. Blumen, *Phys. Today* **55**, 48 (2002).
- [15] W. G. Glockle and T. F. Nonnenmacher, *J. Stat. Phys.* **71**, 755 (1993).
- [16] P. C. Hohenberg and B. I. Galperin, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **49**, 435 (1977); J. L. McCauley, *Phys. Rep.* **189**, 225 (1990).
- [17] A. V. Milovanov and L. M. Zelenyi, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 052101 (2001).
- [18] T. Nakayama, K. Yakubo, and R. L. Orbach, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66**, 381 (1994); A. V. Milovanov and J. J. Rasmussen, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 134505 (2002).
- [19] L. M. Zelenyi and A. V. Milovanov, *Physics-Uspekhi* **174**, 809 (2004).
- [20] H. Weitzner and G. M. Zaslavsky, *Commun. Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation* **8**, 273 (2003).
- [21] R. Metzler and J. Klafter, *Phys. Rep.* **339**, 1 (2000).
- [22] G. M. Zaslavsky, *Phys. Rep.* **371**, 461 (2002).
- [23] R. B. Laughlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50**, 1395 (1983).

- [24] J. G. Bednorz and K. A. Muller, *Z. Phys. B: Condens. Matter* **64**, 189 (1986).
- [25] A. Cho, *Phys. Rev. Focus* **9**, story 12 (2002).
- [26] J. Zaanen, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **59**, 1769 (1998); E. W. Carlson, D. Orgad, S. A. Kivelson, and V. J. Emery, *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, 3422 (2000); S. A. Kivelson, D.-H. Lee, E. Fradkin, and V. Oganessian, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 144516 (2002); Y. Ando, K. Segawa, S. Komiya, and A. N. Lavrov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 137005 (2002).
- [27] V. L. Ginzburg and L. D. Landau, *JETP. (USSR)* **20**, 1064 (1950).
- [28] R. P. Feynman, *Statistical Mechanics* (Benjamin, Massachusetts, 1972); E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevsky, *Theoretical Physics. Volume IX: Statistical Physics* (Nauka, Moscow, 1978).
- [29] J. Feder, *Fractals* (Plenum, New York, 1988); M. Schroeder, *Fractals, Chaos, Power Laws* (W. H. Freeman, New York, 1991).
- [30] P. Bak, C. Tang, and K. Wiesenfeld, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 381 (1987); *Phys. Rev. A* **38**, 364 (1988); H. J. Jensen, *Self-Organized Criticality* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998).
- [31] S. L. Ginzburg and N. E. Savitskaya, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 026128 (2002).
- [32] K. B. Oldham and J. Spanier, *The Fractional Calculus* (Academic Press, San Diego, 1974); S. G. Samko, A. A. Kilbas, and O. I. Marichev, *Fractional Integrals and Derivatives and Their Applications* (Nauka i Tekhnika, Minsk, 1987) (translated by Harwood Academic); K. S. Miller and B. Ross, *An Introduction to the Fractional Calculus and Fractional Differential Equations* (Wiley, New York, 1993).
- [33] V. S. Vladimirov, *Equations of Mathematical Physics* (Nauka, Moscow, 1988).
- [34] L. P. Gorkov, *JETP (USSR)* **9**, 1364 (1959).
- [35] H. Buttner and A. Blumen, *Nature* **329**, 700 (1987).
- [36] J. Bardeen, L. N. Cooper, and J. R. Schrieffer, *Phys. Rev.* **108**, 1175 (1957).
- [37] W. A. Little, *J. Polym. Sci., Part C: Polym. Symp.* **29**, 17 (1970).
- [38] M. Prester, *Phys. Rev. B* **60**, 3100 (1999).
- [39] J. W. Clark, V. A. Khodel, M. V. Zverev, and V. M. Yakovenko, *Phys. Rep.* **391**, 123 (2004).